

THE HONORABLE RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

ANDREY LAVRENTYEV and TATYANA  
LAVRENTYEV, a married couple,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GEICO ADVANTAGE INSURANCE  
COMPANY, a foreign insurer,

Defendant.

No. 2:21-cv-00726-RSM

STIPULATED MOTION TO CONTINUE  
TRIAL AND AMEND CASE SCHEDULE  
AND ORDER

Note on Motion Calendar:  
December 2, 2021

**I. AGREED MOTION**

Plaintiffs Andrey and Tatyana Lavrentyev and Defendant Geico Advantage Insurance Company (collectively “the parties”) bring this joint motion pursuant to LCR 10(g) and respectfully request that this Court modify its July 27, 2021 Order (Dkt. No. 10) by rescheduling the July 11, 2022 jury trial date by approximately 60 days and similarly adjusting all discovery and trial-related deadlines as set forth below in Section III of this motion.

This matter was originally filed on removal from King County Superior Court on June 2, 2021 (Dkt. No. 1). The parties’ joint status report and discovery plan was filed July 9, 2021 (Dkt. No. 9) and the Order setting trial date and related dates (Dkt. No. 10) was entered July 27, 2021. Since that time, the parties have diligently exchanged initial disclosures and have



1 conducted extensive written discovery, with GEICO Advantage producing nearly 1,000 pages  
 2 of documents, which consist of its claim file and non-privileged communications pertaining to  
 3 this matter.

4 The parties have been working to complete outstanding discovery, but with Plaintiff's  
 5 illness and the number of witnesses for GEICO Advantage still to be deposed, depositions  
 6 cannot be completed with sufficient time for the parties to provide complete information to their  
 7 experts to complete expert reports by the January 12, 2022 deadline. To that end, the parties  
 8 have agreed, subject to the court moving the trial and related dates, to conduct depositions of  
 9 GEICO Advantage's corporate designee and GEICO employees in late January. The parties  
 10 have also agreed to conduct a mediation in January in an attempt to resolve this matter before  
 11 expending additional time and resources completing discovery. Good cause exists for a  
 12 continuance of the trial date and related deadlines as outlined below.

## 13 **II. GOOD CAUSE IS ESTABLISHED**

14 Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b) provides that "a schedule shall not be modified except upon a  
 15 showing of good cause and by leave of the district judge . . . ." A party moving to amend a  
 16 schedule should show that the deadlines presented cannot reasonably be met despite the  
 17 diligence of the party seeking an extension. *Pfeiffer v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 137 F.R.D. 352, 355  
 18 (D. Kan. 1991); *Sithon Maritime Co. v. Holiday Mansion*, 177 F.R.D. 504, 508 (D. Kan. 1998);  
 19 Wright & Miller, *6A Federal Practice & Procedure*, § 1522.1, p. 230-31 (citing Advisory  
 20 Committee notes to 1983 Amendment to Rule 16); *ICU Med., Inc. v. Ryemed Tech., Inc.*, 674 F.  
 21 Supp. 2d 574, 577 (D. Del. 2009). Courts should grant extensions when the moving party can  
 22 show that it has worked diligently to position the case for trial or for disposition by motion, but  
 23 unforeseeable circumstances or events beyond its control denied the moving party a fair  
 24 opportunity to develop the evidence it needs under the existing scheduling order. *See*, 3 James  
 25  
 26

1 Wm. Moore et al., *Moore's Federal Practice* § 16.14. "Good cause" exists when the moving  
 2 party has been generally diligent, the need for more time was neither foreseeable nor its fault,  
 3 and refusing to grant the continuance would create a substantial risk of unfairness to that party.  
 4 *ICU Med., Inc.*, 674 F. Supp. 2d at 577. To establish "good cause," parties seeking modification  
 5 of a scheduling order must generally show that, even with the exercise of due diligence, they  
 6 cannot meet the order's timetable. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609  
 7 (9th Cir. 1992).  
 8

9 Here, the parties have been diligent in conducting discovery but unforeseen events and  
 10 the parties' discovery needs warrant an extension of the trial date and discovery and trial-related  
 11 deadlines. Under the current case deadlines, the parties will be unable to complete depositions  
 12 of witnesses, including GEICO Advantage's corporate designee(s) and employees, before the  
 13 expert disclosure cut off.  
 14

15 **A. *Plaintiff's illness and recent return to the United States***

16 Both Plaintiffs have been dealing with Ms. Lavrentyev's serious health issues which has  
 17 required them to travel to outside of the United States for medical treatment. Plaintiffs only  
 18 recently arrived back in the states and treatment will likely continue. As a result of Plaintiff's  
 19 illness, the parties postponed Mr. Lavrentyev's deposition to December of 2021 and Ms.  
 20 Lavrentyev's deposition has not yet been scheduled. Continuing the discovery cutoff will allow  
 21 the parties to schedule Ms. Lavrentyev's deposition so it does not interfere with her health and  
 22 medical treatment.  
 23

24 ///

25 ///

26 **B. *Extensive discovery needs***



1 GEICO Advantage has produced nearly 1,000 pages of claim file documents and email  
2 communications which pertain to Plaintiffs' claim(s) with Geico and which are related to the  
3 basis of Plaintiffs' Complaint against GEICO Advantage. The parties are currently working to  
4 reach an agreement on the production of additional records from GEICO Advantage. Extending  
5 the expert disclosure deadline will allow the parties to complete the exchange of documents.  
6

7 **C. *Plaintiffs' depositions of GEICO Advantage's corporate designee and***  
8 ***employees.***

9 Plaintiffs have noted depositions of GEICO Advantage's corporate designee and  
10 GEICO Advantages employees, but with the number of witnesses, the prep time involved for  
11 those depositions, and the holidays in the month of December, the witnesses will not all be  
12 available for their depositions with sufficient time for Plaintiffs to provide information to their  
13 experts by the January 12, 2022 expert disclosure deadline. In addition, the parties hope to  
14 mediate in January of 2022, prior to conducting additional discovery and incurring related costs.

15 **D. *No prior continuances***

16 Lastly, this is the parties' first request for a continuance of the trial date or related  
17 deadlines and the parties do not anticipate requesting any future continuances.

18 In order to effectuate the parties' discovery needs outlined above, the parties have  
19 agreed to conduct depositions of GEICO Advantage in January of 2022, subject to the Court  
20 granting a 60-day extension of the trial deadline and discovery deadlines.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26



### III. PROPOSED REVISED CASE SCHEDULE

The parties request that the Court revise the case schedule as follows:

Activity	Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
Trial Date	July 11, 2022	August 29, 2022
Deadline for amending pleadings and joining additional parties	August 24, 2021	October 25, 2021
Reports from expert witnesses under FRCP 26(a)(2) due	January 12, 2022	March 14, 2022
Deadline for filing motions related to discovery. Any such motions shall be noted for consideration pursuant to LCR 7(d)(3)	February 11, 2022	April 12, 2022
Discovery completed by	March 14, 2022	May 13, 2022
All dispositive motions must be filed by and noted on the motion calendar no later than the fourth Friday thereafter (see LCR 7(d))	March 17, 2022	May 16, 2022
Mediation, per LCR 39.1(c)(3), if requested by the parties, held no later than	May 27, 2022	July 26, 2022
All motions in limine must be filed by and noted on the motion calendar no later than the THIRD Friday thereafter.	June 13, 2022	August 1, 2022
Agreed pretrial order due	June 29, 2022	August 17, 2022
Pretrial conference to be scheduled by the Court.	TBD	TBD
Trial briefs, proposed voir dire questions, proposed jury instructions, and trial exhibits due	July 6, 2022	August 24, 2022

//

//



1 DATED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 2021.

2 WILSON SMITH COCHRAN DICKERSON

3 By: s/Alfred E. Donohue

4 By: s/Katherine B. White

5 Alfred E. Donohue, WSBA No. 32774

6 Katherine B. White, WSBA No. 46649

7 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1700

8 Seattle, WA 98164-2050

9 P: (206) 623-4100 / F: (206) 623-9273

10 Email: donohue@wscd.com / white@wscd.com

11 Of Attorneys for Defendant GEICO Advantage

12 DATED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 2021.

13 MOORE LAW GROUP PLLC

14 By: s/Joseph Moore

15 Joseph W. Moore, WSBA No. 44061

16 1604 Hewitt Ave., Suite 515

17 Everett, WA 98201

18 P: 425-998-8999 / F: 425-903-3638

19 Email: joseph@moore.law

20 Attorney for Plaintiff

**ORDER**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 17<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021.



**RICARDO S. MARTINEZ**  
**CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

